DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 256 270 HE 018 336

AUTHOR Hunziker, Celeste M.
TITLE Evaluation of the Individualized Study Program: Reduced Study Load Option and Basic Skills Workshops.
INSTITUTION California Univ., Davis. Office of Student Affairs Research and Information.
PUB DATE Mar 85
NOTE 41p.; For related documents, see HE 018 333 and HE 018 343.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; Academic Persistence; Basic Skills; *College Students; Comparative Analysis; *Developmental Studies Programs; *Disadvantaged; Full Time Students; Grade Point Average; Higher Education; *High Risk Students; *Individualized Instruction; Nontraditional Students; Open Enrollment; Part Time Students; Program Evaluation; *Remedial Programs; Selective Admission; State Universities
IDENTIFIERS Course Load; *University of California Davis

ABSTRACT

The Individualized Study Program (ISP) at the University of California, Davis, which is designed to enhance retention of students with academic skill deficiencies, was evaluated. The target group was disadvantaged students who had not met the university's entrance requirements. Attention was focused on two aspects of the program: allowing students to reduce their academic unit load and individualized study programs provided through workshops. ISP participants spent 2-5 hours per week in basic skills workshops for one academic quarter. Students who participated in the workshops and who reduced their academic load earned approximately the same grade point averages as two comparison groups: students who attended workshops but did not reduce their load, and students who did not participate in the ISP. Participants did as well or better than their comparison group, even though they entered the university with significantly lower Scholastic Aptitude Test scores. Intensive remedial assistance during the first quarter appeared to be more beneficial than assistance provided after students had academic difficulty. Appendices include a description of ISP offerings, a sample ISP contract, and information on ISP students who did not return for a second year. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED256270

EVALUATION OF THE INDIVIDUALIZED STUDY PROGRAM

Reduced Study Load Option and Basic Skills Workshops

Celeste M. Hunziker

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Student Affairs
Research & Information
Univ of CA, Davis

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

HE018336

Student Affairs Research and Information
University of California, Davis
March 1985

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Individualized Study Program (ISP) consists of 1) the Early Warning System (EWS), a tracking and academic advising system; 2) a reduced study load option, and 3) basic skills workshops. Most students invited to participate in ISP also participate in the EWS and receive counseling in course load and selection, tutoring and referrals to support services. A separate evaluation suggests that the EWS is an important intermediate step toward improving student retention. For the most part, students counseled through this system followed the academic advice they received, earned successful grades in targeted course work, and had fourth quarter retention rates 15 to 20% higher than students not interviewed.

In addition to EWS services, formal ISP participants attend basic skills workshops and sign contracts allowing them to reduce their study loads below 12 units; informal participants attend the same workshops but do not reduce their study loads. This evaluation seeks evidence of identifiable effects from the reduced study load and basic skills workshop components of ISP.

ISP formal participants fulfilled their contracts and earned approximately the same GPAs as informal participants and students who did not receive intensive counselor assistance. Tracking students through a second year did not reveal any long term effects of reduced study loads on overall academic performance. Fourth quarter retention rates of formal participants were 6 to 15% lower than those of informal participants and nonparticipants. Although formal participants did not take 12 units for one quarter, they completed about the same number of minimum progress units as other students in this study. Overall, use of the reduced study load option does not appear to prevent students from resuming a full course load in succeeding quarters.

There do not appear to be any group differences in overall academic performance resulting from workshop participation. Formal and informal participants earn about the same GPAs as students who do not participate in the workshops. However, students who attended verbal workshops earned satisfactory grades in both remedial and nonremedial English courses. Students who attended math workshops experienced more limited success in mathematics courses, suggesting that two hours per week of basic skills work for a single quarter may not be sufficient for students with weak backgrounds in this area.

The data in this report suggest that intensive remedial assistance during fall quarter may benefit some students. Fall 1981 formal students outperformed their comparison group and consistently maintained passing GPAs. Fall 1982 formal and informal participants did as well as their comparison group, even though they entered the University with significantly lower SAT scores. On the other hand, students who received similar assistance, but later in the year after experiencing considerable academic difficulty, did not benefit as much. In general, although these students reduced the number of units of unsatisfactory grades earned during a quarter, they did not improve sufficiently to get out of academic difficulty.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	page
Executive Summary	ii
Introduction	1
Evaluation Design	4
Evaluation Questions	9
Summary and Conclusions	20
Program Response to Evaluation Findings	23

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1	Profile of the ISP Target Population	7
Table 2	Mean Academic Characteristics of the ISP Target Population	8
Table 3	ISP Participation by Quarter	9
Table 4	ISP Mean Workshop Hours Per Week by Quarter	10
Table 5	ISP Contract Summary	11
Table 6	Minimum Progress of ISP Students and Comparison Groups	12
Table 7	Performance in English Courses of ISP Students	13
Table 8	Performance in Math Courses of ISP Students	14
Table 9	Academic Performance of ISP Students and Comparison Groups: Fall 1981 Entrants	16
Table 10	Academic Performance of ISP Students and Comparison Groups: Fall 1982 Entrants	17
Table 11	Retention of ISP Students and Comparison Groups	19

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix A	Individualized Study Program: Description of Offerings	A-1
Appendix B	Individualized Study Program Contract	B-1
Appendix C	Individualized Study Program: Weekly Program Hours by Workshop	C-1
Appendix D	Profiles of ISP Students Who Did Not Return for a Second Year	D-1

INTRODUCTION

Since 1981-82, the Learning Skills Center (LSC) at UC Davis has offered a reduced study load program designed to strengthen the basic skills of selected EOP special action students.[1] This program, called the Individualized Study Program (ISP), enables participants to reduce their study loads below 12 units and to substitute, for each unit below 12, three hours a week of self-paced course work, laboratory work or intensive counselor assistance. Although ISP participants do not earn baccalaureate or workload credits for these remedial activities, they are allowed to waive the University's minimum progress requirements and are considered full-time students in order to maintain their eligibility for financial aid and other campus services.

Background

ISP was developed in part as a response to findings presented in the Report of the UC Davis Task Force on Retention and Transfer (June 1980). The findings of this Report indicate that, in general, special action freshman entrants graduate at one-third the rate of their regularly admitted peers. In addition, the Report suggests that attrition of special action students is not likely to be voluntary; special action freshman entrants are five times more likely to leave the University in academic difficulty[2] than are their regularly admitted peers.

As a result of these findings, the Retention Task Force recommended that all EOP special action entrants be required to participate in the summer bridge portion of the Special Transitional Enrichment Program (STEP). This program assists underprepared students to strengthen their learning skills and study habits, and enhances students' readiness to do University work by providing a week of orientation and three weeks of instruction prior to the fall quarter. STEP also assists students' adjustment to UC Davis by providing living experiences in residence halls and general orientation to campus life. Because individual student circumstances (e.g., financial obligations, health problems, etc.) precluded full implementation of an across-the-board requirement of summer STEP attendance and because certain summer STEP attendees indicated a need for continued assistance, ISP was proposed as one of several academic-year extensions of summer STEP.[3]

---

[1] EOP (Educational Opportunity Program) students apply for and are accepted into EOP on the basis of past unequal educational opportunity or disadvantage, regardless of ethnicity or admission status. Special action includes all students admitted by exception to the University's admissions requirements, regardless of ethnicity or prior disadvantage.

[2] Cumulative and/or last quarter GPA below 2.0.

[3] Other extensions include special sections of English R and A, Math B and D, mandatory quarterly EOP/SAA counseling, and faculty advising appointments.

Objectives

ISP seeks to assess individual academic support needs and to assist students in meeting these needs through intensive basic skills workshops and individual consultations. The assumption behind ISP is that the availability of such assistance will increase the chances of academic success in college for high risk students. The objectives of ISP are (1) to develop students' skills to the point where they can deal effectively with college level material, (2) to reduce the extent of academic difficulty for students with poor grades, and (3) to improve retention of selected high risk, EOP special action students.

Selection Criteria

Students are invited to participate in ISP according to the following priorities:

Fall Quarter

a. summer STEP participants whose diagnostic test scores and performance indicate a need for continued individual assistance in reading, writing or mathematics;

b. EOP special action students who are granted a waiver from summer STEP.

Winter and Spring Quarters

a. fall or winter quarter program participants whose performance indicates a need for continued individual assistance;

b. EOP special action students who have not previously participated in ISP but who receive at least one unsatisfactory grade (below C-, NP or U) during fall or winter quarter;

c. other special action students who experience some academic difficulty.

Candidates for winter and spring quarter ISP are identified through an Early Warning System (EWS). This tracking and academic advising system contacts students who have received at least one unsatisfactory grade (below C-, NP or U) during fall or winter quarter and invites them to the LSC for an interview. During the EWS interviews students who appear to need a quarter of basic mathematics and language skills development are strongly encouraged to participate in ISP.

Program Description

Participation in ISP is voluntary. Students who choose to participate have individual interviews with LSC and EOP counselors to review their past academic records and to clarify their present educational goals. If necessary, students complete reading, mathematics and writing diagnostic examinations. Based on the initial interviews and the results of these examinations, participants plan individual study programs from a variety of workshop offerings. (See Appendix A for a description of program offerings.) Individualized instruction is offered in study skills, reading, writing, vocabulary building, mathematics and science. Students also meet periodically with Counseling Center staff to discuss educational goals and adjustment to campus life.

Students may participate in ISP on either a formal or an informal basis. If a student chooses to be a formal participant, the study plan takes the form of a contract, which is signed by the student, the LSC counselor and the EOP counselor. (See Appendix B for a sample contract.) The contract allows students to reduce their study loads but requires them to participate fully in ISP; only students who maintain at least a 90% attendance rate and show clear evidence of effort in their scheduled course work are granted waivers from minimum progress requirements. Students are monitored throughout their ISP participation to ensure their attendance and progress in the program.

Some students choose to participate in ISP on an informal basis. These students receive similar intensive assistance but do not sign contracts or reduce their study loads.

ISP is offered to students during the fall, winter or spring quarter of their first year at UC Davis. In addition to selecting an individual study plan and a formal or informal level of participation, an eligible student may choose to participate in any quarter ISP is offered and, under certain circumstances, may extend participation for more than one quarter.[4]

---

[4]A student must receive approval from the college dean to participate formally for more than one quarter.

EVALUATION DESIGN

An interim report on ISP was issued by Student Affairs Research and Information in January 1983.[5] That report reviewed the initiation of ISP during the 1981-82 academic year and recommended that Fall 1981 entrants be tracked through their second year at UC Davis to identify any long term effects of ISP participation and that selection of ISP participants and method of service delivery be reviewed for 1982-83. The purpose of this report is to follow those two recommmendations and to analyze the effects of the ISP reduced study load option and workshop participation.

The interim ISP report also recommended that special attention be paid to identifying effects of the ISP Early Warning System. Accordingly, a separate evaluation, coordinated with this study, was conducted on EWS.[6] The EWS evaluation indicates that the system is successful in identifying and tracking special action EOP students who earn unsatisfactory grades during fall or winter quarter of their first year at UC Davis. The evaluation documents that students follow most units of academic advice provided during their interviews and that, where measurable, most of these units have successful outcomes. Although a quarter-by-quarter analysis of academic performances reveals no differences in GPAs based on whether students chose to participate in the EWS, the fourth quarter retention rates of EWS participants are 15 to 20% higher than those of nonparticipants. The EWS component of ISP appears to make an important intermediate step toward improving the retention rates of special action EOP students.

Data for this evaluation were collected on EOP special action students who entered UC Davis in Fall 1981 and Fall 1982. Lists of program participants and nonparticipants for each quarter, copies of students' contracts, and ISP assignments were provided to Student Affairs Research and Information by the Learning Skills Center. Demographic, admissions, and quarter-by-quarter academic performance and retention data were obtained from the Student Records System.

Students are analyzed in three groups for each year: formal participants--students who selected the reduced study load option, signed contracts, and attended workshops; informal participants--students who followed individual study plans and attended workshops but did not reduce their study loads; and nonparticipants (ISP declined)--students who, because of their performance in summer STEP or in fall or winter quarter, were invited to participate in ISP but who did not participate in ISP workshops or reduce their study loads.

---

[5] See "Interim Evaluation Report: Individualized Study Program," Alice K. Tom, Student Affairs Research and Information, January 1983.

[6] See "Evaluation of the Individualized Study Program: Early Warning System," Celeste M. Hunziker, Student Affairs Research and Information, September 1984.

Data on one additional group of students were collected for Fall 1982 entrants. This group--ISP excluded--consists of EOP special action students whose performance during summer STEP or during fall and winter quarter was such that they were never invited to participate in ISP. Data on these students, approximately 25% of all Fall 1982 EOP special action entrants, are presented only for general contextual purposes. This group exhibits a level of academic performance that all other ISP groups must begin to achieve if they are to be successful and remain at the University.

Evaluation Questions

The primary issue addressed by this study is whether or not a reduction in study load, together with the substitution of intensive basic skills development activities, can reduce the incidence of academic difficulty and improve the retention of selected EOP special action students. In order to assess the extent to which ISP meets these objectives, the following questions are examined:

1. What were the duration, timing and intensity of program participation for ISP formal and informal students?

2. To what extent did ISP formal students reduce their study loads and comply with their contracts?

3. To what extent did ISP workshop participation enhance students' performance in target courses?

4. Did program participation in winter and spring quarters reduce the extent of students' academic difficulty?

5. Did retention of these selected high risk EOP special action students improve as a result of program participation?

The last two evaluation questions require some standard against which to judge success. Such standards can be defined by the program or derived from comparable populations. Because the ISP proposal (dated: 2/16/81) contained no objective standards of success, a search was made for comparison group standards.

One advantage associated with using such standards to evaluate ISP is that comparing observed outcomes of program participants with those of nonparticipants provides a measure of success for ISP outcomes. Secondly, use of comparison groups allows for some estimate of whether the ISP program is, at least in part, responsible for these outcomes.

However, there are also disadvantages to using comparison groups to evaluate a program like this one. ISP is basically a broad framework for developmental activities; no two students choose the same set, level, degree and timing of program services. Consequently, there is no traditional treatment group in the sense of a collection of people defined by the identical treatment or program they receive.

It is also difficult to identify an appropriate comparison group for ISP participants. Because EOP special action students have been shown to be a high risk population, ISP staff reject random assignment of eligible students to control groups. Therefore, there might be consistent nonprogrammatic differences among ISP and comparison groups that could affect academic performance and retention. In addition, one critical program feature, the Early Warning System, is available to ISP participants and nonparticipants alike. Indeed, most of the students in the ISP declined comparison groups were heavily counseled about course load and course selection and received tutoring and referrals to other campus services. Although heavily "contaminated" in this manner, most of the students in these groups earned at least one poor grade during fall or winter quarter. Because academic performance in college is the strongest predictor of further college performance, ISP declined students represent a high risk population and (keeping in mind the contamination described above) a suitable comparison group for ISP formal and informal students.

Despite difficulties in carrying out some parts of this evaluation, staff and administrators need information about ISP implementation and impact. The detailed tracking of program participants and the comparisons of student outcomes will provide some estimate of how well ISP is meeting its objectives.

A discussion of the demographic and entering academic characteristics of ISP participants and comparison group students follows below. After this discussion, each of the evaluation questions will be addressed in turn. Two statistical techniques (analysis of variance and chi-square test of homogeneity) are used to review ISP formal, informal and declined group data. These analyses test whether differences among the groups are large enough to represent more than random fluctuations.

Target Population

There is a clear profile of ISP participants and comparison group students. As Table 1 indicates, most of these students are ethnic minorities, enter UC Davis directly from high school, and attend summer STEP. Over 20% are special action committee admits;[7] more than two-thirds enter the College of Letters and Science.

The only significant difference in demographic profiles of program participants and nonparticipants is the number of male and female students in each group. More female students participate in ISP and participate on a formal basis (1981: $x^2 = 6.45$, $p < .03$; 1982: $x^2 = 11.71$, $p < .001$). This difference may influence program outcomes because, in general, women achieve higher GPAs at UC Davis than men. It is not clear whether this relationship holds for these high risk students but, if so, the bias would be in favor of ISP formal participants.

---

[7] Students with entering GPAs and subject omissions that do not meet the special action admissions formula.

TABLE 1

PROFILE OF THE ISP TARGET POPULATION
(in percent of students in each group)

	Fall 1981 Entrants			Fall 1982 Entrants			
	ISP Formal (n=36)	ISP Informal (n=24)	ISP Declined (n=57)	ISP Formal (n=20)	ISP Informal (n=24)	ISP Declined (n=94)	ISP Excluded[1] (n=45)
Gender							
Male	27.8%	54.2%	52.6%	20.0%	33.3%	57.4%	71.1%
Female	72.2	45.8	47.4	80.0	66.7	42.6	28.9
Ethnicity							
Black/Afro-American	25.0	50.0	51.8	65.0	21.7	39.4	24.4
Chicano/Mexican-American	16.7	16.7	10.7	5.0	17.4	16.0	15.6
Latino/Spanish-American	2.8	0.0	3.6	10.0	4.3	7.4	13.3
American Indian	5.6	0.0	3.6	0.0	4.3	3.2	2.2
Pilipino	11.1	4.2	5.4	5.0	13.1	10.6	8.9
SAA Subtotal	61.2	70.9	75.1	85.0	60.7	76.6	64.4
Asian	13.9	29.2	16.1	10.0	34.8	9.6	22.2
White	22.2	0.0	7.1	5.0	4.3	11.7	13.3
Other	2.8	0.0	1.8	0.0	0.0	2.1	0.0
STEP							
Attended	77.8	70.8	78.9	70.0	75.0	62.8	55.6
Waived	22.2	29.2	21.1	30.0	25.0	37.2	44.4
Entry Level							
High School	66.7	83.3	63.2	70.0	75.0	77.7	57.8
Advanced Standing[2]	33.3	16.7	36.8	30.0	25.0	22.3	42.2
Special Action Status							
Formula	55.6	70.8	67.9	68.4	83.3	78.5	84.0
Committee	44.4	29.2	32.1	31.6	16.7	21.5	15.9
Admit College							
L & S	72.2	70.8	68.4	85.0	66.7	62.8	66.7
A & ES	13.9	8.3	24.6	5.0	20.8	24.5	15.6
Engineering	13.9	20.8	7.0	10.0	12.5	12.8	17.8

Note: Students must have completed at least one quarter to be included in these data.

[1]EOP special action students who were never invited to participate in ISP. Data were not collected on Fall 1981 ISP excluded students.
[2]Entered with 12.0 or more units of college credit.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The entering GPAs of high school admits differ little when compared on the basis of program participation. As Table 2 indicates, students who participated in ISP have admit GPAs similar to those of students who declined certain program services. However, Fall 1982 students excluded from ISP participation because of strong academic performance during the first year began with admit GPAs significantly stronger than those of any other group ($F = 2.74$, $p < .04$).

TABLE 2
MEAN ACADEMIC CHARACTERISTICS OF THE ISP TARGET POPULATION
HIGH SCHOOL ADMITS

	Fall 1981 Entrants			Fall 1982 Entrants			
	ISP Formal (n=23)	ISP Informal (n=19)	ISP Declined (n=33)	ISP Formal (n=14)	ISP Informal (n=17)	ISP Declined (n=68)	ISP Excluded[1] (n=25)
Admit GPA	2.59	2.81	2.69	2.74	2.81	2.76	3.03
SAT Verbal	320	355	367	310	296	371	352
SAT Math	390	400	414	395	425	453	431

[1]EOP special action students who were never invited to participate in ISP. Data were not collected on Fall 1981 ISP excluded students.

Although ISP participants and nonparticipants have similar admit GPAs, participants in both years have lower SAT scores. The scores of ISP formal participants are particularly weaker, ranging from 70 (1981-82) to 120 points (1982-83) lower than nonparticipants. ISP participants entering in 1982 have significantly lower verbal SAT scores ($F = 5.86$, $p < .004$) than students in their comparison group. This difference in SAT scores, particularly for 1982-83 participants, may also affect the comparison group analyses. To the extent that SAT scores indicate weaker academic preparation, ISP students may well be at higher risk than students in the comparison groups.

EVALUATION QUESTIONS

Question 1 What were the duration, timing and intensity of program participation for ISP formal and informal students?

ISP participants comprised approximately one-third to one-quarter of all EOP special action students entering in Fall 1981 and Fall 1982 respectively. As Table 3 indicates, most of them participated in the program for a single quarter. ISP formal and informal students who participated for more than one quarter did so on an informal basis; only one student participated on a formal basis for more than one quarter.

TABLE 3
ISP PARTICIPATION BY QUARTER
(in percent of students)

	Fall 1981 Entrants		Fall 1982 Entrants	
	ISP Formal (n=36)	ISP Informal (n=24)	ISP Formal (n=20)	ISP Informal (n=24)
First Participated				
Fall Quarter	38.9%	12.5%	30.0%	50.0%
Winter Quarter	47.2	50.0	50.0	37.5
Spring Quarter	13.9	37.5	20.0	12.5
Participated				
One Quarter	72.2%	87.5%	70.0%	87.5%
More Than One Quarter	27.8	12.5	30.0	12.5

Table 3 indicates that the majority of students participated in ISP during winter or spring quarter, after having fallen into some academic difficulty. All winter and spring quarter participants, invited into ISP through the Early Warning System, had received at least one unsatisfactory grade during the previous quarter.

ISP allows formal participants to reduce their workloads by as much as 3 or 4 units and spend 9 to 12 hours per week at the LSC improving their basic skills (each workload unit equals 3 LSC hours per week). In general, ISP participants chose a much less intensive program. Although they may have met individually with counselors and elected to receive tutoring in

specific courses,[8] the number of hours spent in workshops on basic skills development fell well below the 9 to 12 hours allowed. As Table 4 indicates, ISP formal students spent between 3 and 5 hours per week in workshops. ISP informal students spent about half that time in their programs. The 1981-82 students, especially formal participants, spent more time in the program than did participants in the second year.

TABLE 4
ISP MEAN WORKSHOP HOURS PER WEEK
BY QUARTER

	Fall Quarter	Winter Quarter	Spring Quarter	Year
ISP Formal				
Fall 1981 Entrants	6.07	4.88	5.33	5.37
Fall 1982 Entrants	3.75	3.45	4.50	3.75
ISP Informal				
Fall 1981 Entrants	3.33	1.92	2.25	2.62
Fall 1982 Entrants	2.58	1.72	1.80	2.11

Participants spent most of their program hours developing basic verbal and mathematical skills. Given the level of verbal skills indicated by participant SAT scores, it is not surprising that verbal workshops were the most heavily attended for both program levels in each year. Students spent approximately two hours per week in these workshops. Math workshops were the next most popular offering; students spent slightly less time developing skills in this area. Appendix C details specific ISP workshop hours for each group of students.

ISP operates as both an intensive first quarter preventive intervention and a quick followup for students receiving unsatisfactory grades in the preceeding quarter. Despite the option to participate in 9 to 12 hours a week of basic skills workshops, on average students chose to do so about 2 to 5 hours per week. Because of student participation patterns, ISP operated less as a means of preventing high risk students from getting into academic difficulty than as a means by which students having already earned one or more poor grades could get out of academic difficulty.

Question 2 To what extent did ISP formal students reduce their study loads and comply with their contracts?

ISP formal students did not reduce their course loads to the extent allowed by the program. Only about 20% of 1981-82 formal participants chose

[8] In 1981-82, approximately half of the participants were tutored; sessions averaged from 9 to 12 per quarter.

to reduce their workloads by the equivalent of one or more courses. None of the formal participants in 1982-83 chose to do so.

As Table 5 indicates, students in both years spent the required three hours in workshops for each unit below the 12 required for full-time status. In addition, ISP students as a whole participated fully in their programs; only three students in each year did not complete their scheduled course work and meet the terms of their contracts.

TABLE 5
ISP CONTRACT SUMMARY

	Fall 1981 Entrants (n=36)	Fall 1982 Entrants (n=20)
Units Reduced		
0.0 to 0.5	17.1%	5.3%
1.0 to 1.5	40.0	89.5
2.0 to 2.5	20.0	5.3
3.0 to 3.5	11.4	0.0
4.0 to 4.5	8.6	0.0
5.0 and over	2.9	0.0
Mean Units Reduced	1.70	1.08
Mean Weekly Hours in ISP Workshops	5.37	3.75
Completed Contract	91.7%	85.0%

Given the a priori difficulty of demonstrating positive effects of remedial programs like ISP, it is important to ask whether pulling students out of the established curriculum makes it difficult for them to catch up with their cohorts and resume a full study load. As Table 6 indicates, ISP formal students earned almost as many workload units by the end of their first year as ISP declined students. Overall there were no statistical differences among ISP formal, informal and declined students in workload units completed at the end of their third or sixth quarter.

TABLE 6
MINIMUM PROGRESS OF ISP STUDENTS
AND COMPARISON GROUPS

	Fall 1981 Entrants			Fall 1982 Entrants		
	ISP Formal	ISP Informal	ISP Declined	ISP Formal	ISP Informal	ISP Declined
First Year Minimum Progress Units	30.48	35.17	32.45	32.46	38.09	34.39
Minimum Progress Units after Six Quarters	69.84	73.58	69.40	NA	NA	NA
Percent of First Year Workload Earning Baccalaureate Credit	70.9%	70.0%	76.2%	64.3%	77.0%	84.0%

NA=not available

Although the number of minimum progress units earned by ISP participants and nonparticipants differed little after the third or sixth quarter, fewer of the units earned by ISP participants carry baccalaureate credit. Approximately 30% of the first year workload of ISP formal and informal students is spent in remedial courses, which do not carry credit toward graduation.

Overall, ISP formal students comply with both the spirit and letter of their contracts. They complete a sufficient number of program hours to make up for their reduced course loads and do not lag behind their cohorts in succeeding quarters. There are no statistical differences in minimum progress units among any of the ISP groups after either the third or sixth quarter.

Question 3 To what extent did ISP workshop participation enhance students' performance in target courses?

One measure of short run program impact is how well students perform in specific courses. ISP students were tracked through their first three quarters to see whether those who participated in ISP verbal or mathematics workshops succeeded in their following English and mathematics courses. The figures cited may underestimate the actual achievement of ISP winter and spring participants because fewer than three quarters of work were examined for these students. Only courses taken concurrent with or immediately following ISP participation are counted. For purposes of this specific analysis, students are considered to be formal participants if they participated on this basis for one quarter, regardless of whether they

participated informally in succeeding quarters. Formal and informal students who participated for more than one quarter are tracked from their first quarter of participation.

A majority of ISP participants took verbal workshops and, as Table 7 illustrates, for the most part these students translated their workshop participation into academic success in both remedial and nonremedial English courses.

Most students who signed up for verbal workshops proceeded almost immediately to take English courses. Close to 90% of these students received grades of C- or better in these courses. Over a third of the students took nonremedial English classes and all were successful in their courses.

TABLE 7
PERFORMANCE IN ENGLISH COURSES OF ISP STUDENTS
WHO TOOK VERBAL WORKSHOPS

	Fall 1981 Entrants		Fall 1982 Entrants	
	ISP Formal (n=36)	ISP Informal (n=24)	ISP Formal (n=20)	ISP Informal (n=24)
Took Verbal Workshops[1]	86.1%	75.0%	60.0%	83.3%
Went on to take at least one English Course[2]	61.2	83.3	75.0	86.4
Received a grade of C- or better	89.5	86.7	88.9	94.7
Took a Nonremedial English Course	35.6	44.4	46.7	36.8
Received a grade of C- or better	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total Attempts at English Courses	33	22	14	27
Total Number of Successful English Courses Completed[3]	30	18	9	26
Percent Successful	90.9%	81.8%	64.2%	96.3%

[1]Students must have completed the ISP quarter.
[2]Includes English A and R (remedial courses) and English 1, 25 and 26.
[3]Does not include incompletes or courses taken prior to ISP participation.

The number of unsuccessful attempts at passing an English course is also shown on Table 7. The number of English courses passed with a grade of C- or better divided by the total number of times a student attempted an English course provides an overall success rate. ISP students who took verbal workshops generally earned passing grades in their first attempt at succeeding course work. Formal participants in 1982-83 had the lowest overall success rate; of the nine students who took English courses, six were successful at their first attempt.

Students who participated in the ISP math workshops had more difficulty translating this support into success in succeeding math courses. As indicated by their SAT scores, these students were underprepared for college level mathematics. In general, the math SAT scores for mathematics workshop participants were 60 to 80 points below the average math SATs of all program participants. Table 8 indicates that, while large numbers of three of the four participant groups ultimately completed at least one math

TABLE 8
PERFORMANCE IN MATH COURSES OF ISP STUDENTS
WHO TOOK MATHEMATICS WORKSHOPS

	Fall 1981 Entrants		Fall 1982 Entrants	
	ISP Formal (n=36)	ISP Informal (n=24)	ISP Formal (n=20)	ISP Informal (n=24)
Took Math Workshops[1]	72.2%	41.7%	55.0%	20.8%
Went on to take at least one Math Course[2]	80.8	72.7	63.6	60.0
Received a grade of C- or better	85.7	25.0	71.4	100.0
Took a Nonremedial Math Course	42.3	37.5	14.3	66.7
Received a grade of C- or better	27.2	0.0	0.0	100.0
Total Attempts at Math Courses	41	8	14	9
Total Number of Successful Math Courses Completed[3]	21	2	8	5
Percent Successful	51.2%	25.0%	57.1%	55.6%

[1]Students must have completed the ISP quarter.
[2]Includes Math B, D, pre and co classes (remedial courses), Math 16A, Math 21A, 21B, Math 11 and Math 22C.
[3]Does not include incompletes or courses taken prior to ISP participation.

course successfully, most students either took more than one try at a course to earn a satisfactory grade or were unsuccessful in another math course. Few students attempted nonremedial math courses, such as those in the Math 16 and 21 series; of those who did, even fewer earned a grade of C- or above.

For the most part ISP verbal workshop participants succeeded in their pursuant course work. This finding is particularly striking for 1982-83 participants who entered the University with very low verbal SAT scores. Students who took mathematics workshops experienced limited success in their related course work although ultimately most of them were able to earn a satisfactory grade in at least one course. One explanation for the number of unsuccessful attempts at passing math courses may be that skills developed in two hours a week study of, for example, algebra may not be transferable to succeeding courses in other areas, such as calculus. It may be necessary for students with very weak backgrounds in mathematics or in majors with mathematics requirements to take more than one math workshop or to take math workshops for more than one quarter to prepare intensively for each specific math course or series.

Question 4 — Did program participation in winter and spring quarters reduce the extent of students' academic difficulty?

A major impetus behind the development of ISP was concern over the attrition in academic difficulty experienced by EOP special action students. In order for these students to remain at the University, the extent of their academic difficulty has to be reduced. Tables 9 and 10 contain the quarterly GPAs and number of unsuccessful units earned by ISP students. Because over 30% of the workload taken by ISP students is remedial in content (and therefore not included in their GPAs), the number of unsuccessful units earned is presented on these tables to give precision to the concept of academic difficulty that GPAs alone for these students cannot measure.

For the most part, there are no statistical differences in either the current or cumulative GPAs shown on these tables, based on program status. Overall, students who participated in ISP workshops and/or who chose the reduced study load option earned approximately the same GPAs as students who declined these services.

Although the data on Tables 9 and 10 do not reflect an effect on GPAs from these ISP services, they do suggest that academic performance differs depending upon when ISP students receive program services and the extent of academic difficulty they are in when entering the program. Fall participants, who as a group have entering characteristics similar to winter and spring participants, do well throughout their first year. They consistently maintain a mean GPA of 2.0 or greater and keep the number of unsuccessful units earned to the equivalent of one course or less. Data on Fall 1981 participants indicate that they maintained that success throughout their second year. Fall 1981 formal participants[9] performed somewhat

[9]There were only three informal participants in Fall 1981.

TABLE 9
ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE OF ISP STUDENTS AND COMPARISON GROUPS BY QUARTER
Fall 1981 Entrants

	Fall GPA Unsuc Units[1]	Winter GPA Unsuc Units	Spring GPA Unsuc Units	1981-82[2] Cumm GPA	1982-83[3] Cumm GPA
Fall Quarter					
Formal (n=14)	2.49* 1.71*	2.38 2.61	2.53 2.70	2.46	2.45
Informal (n=3)	2.13* 4.66*	2.03 4.00	2.35 5.66	2.17	2.40
Declined (n=16)	2.13 3.53	1.80 4.93	2.30 2.40	2.15	2.49
Winter Quarter					
Formal (n=17)	1.97 6.94	2.02* 2.06*	2.36 2.85	2.15	2.09
Informal (n=14)	1.92 5.28	1.99* 4.42*	2.19 4.28	2.09	2.04
Declined (n=38)	2.04 4.40	1.98 3.48	1.97 3.25	2.15	2.15
Spring Quarter					
Formal (n=6)	1.93 4.83	0.50 6.66	1.48* 3.60*	1.23	2.09
Informal (n=13)	2.33 3.25	2.28 3.91	1.94* 5.15*	2.28	2.17
Declined (n=52)	2.23 3.18	1.72 5.30	2.22 3.22	2.17	2.05

*Indicates ISP participation

[1]Number of units receiving NP or U grades, or grades below C-. Does not include incompletes.
[2]For students who completed three quarters.
[3]For students who completed six quarters.

TABLE 10
ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE OF ISP STUDENTS AND COMPARISON GROUPS BY QUARTER
Fall 1982 Entrants

	Fall GPA Unsuc Units[1]	Winter GPA Unsuc Units	Spring GPA Unsuc Units	1982-83[2] Cumm GPA
Fall Quarter				
Formal (n=6)	2.06*	2.73	2.25	2.39
	3.16*	1.00	3.00	
Informal (n=10)	2.46*	2.64	2.31	2.46
	2.90*	3.77	2.25	
Declined (n=25)	2.34	2.37	2.34	2.41
	3.84	3.04	2.50	
Winter Quarter				
Formal (n=10)	1.43	1.81*	1.69	1.81
	6.40	3.88*	6.00	
Informal (n=15)	2.36	2.23*	2.29	2.27
	4.07	1.86*	1.20	
Declined (n=74)	1.84	2.09	2.14	2.12
	5.47	3.89	3.66	
Spring Quarter				
Formal (n=4)	2.40	2.24	2.05*	2.28
	1.00	7.66	3.00*	
Informal (n=9)	2.01	1.49	2.18*	1.96
	4.33	4.55	2.77*	
Declined (n=69)	2.01	1.95	2.15	2.14
	4.32	5.15	3.75	

*Indicates ISP participation

[1]Number of units receiving NP or U grades, or grades below C-. Does not include incompletes.
[2]For students who completed three quarters.

better than their comparison group. Fall 1982 formal and informal participants performed as well as or slightly better than their comparison group even though their SAT scores would indicate that they were less well prepared for University work.

In general, winter and spring quarter participants reduced the number of units of unsatisfactory grades and kept those units below the number with which they entered the program. Despite this finding, winter or spring quarter students who came into the program in very serious academic difficulty were unable to improve sufficiently to get out of academic difficulty. The academic profiles of ISP students who eventually left the University (Tables D-1 through D-4 in Appendix D) reveal that most of these students were unable to succeed in their course work, even while receiving intensive counselor assistance. These data suggest that the program is most successful with its fall participants but is not able to help appreciably students identified after they are in serious academic trouble.

Without random assignment of students to ISP and comparison groups, it is not possible to conclude with certainty that these academic outcomes are caused by participation in ISP. As discussed above, ISP participants differ in two ways from the comparison groups. They differ in gender and, particularly for Fall 1982 entrants, in academic preparation as reflected by their SAT scores. These differences may well influence the academic performance outcomes. In addition, over 50% of the ISP declined groups were interviewed through the ISP Early Warning System. Because the EWS evaluation indicates that approximately 80% of interviewed students follow through on at least some of the academic advice they receive, the comparison groups have been contaminated with what appears to be the most effective aspect of ISP.

Question 5 — Did retention of these selected high risk EOP special action students improve as a result of program participation?

By preparing students for college level course work and by reducing the extent of their academic difficulty, ISP proposes to increase the retention rate of selected high risk students. Although ISP has made limited progress in meeting the first two prerequisites, this progress does not appear sufficient to have an effect on the retention of formal and informal participants.

As Table 11 indicates, ISP students who reduced their study loads had lower fourth quarter retention rates for both years than either ISP informal or ISP declined students. The gap becomes smaller with each year in college, and data for 1981-82 students indicate that, by the fourth year, the retention rates for all ISP groups are about the same.

TABLE 11
RETENTION OF ISP STUDENTS AND COMPARISON GROUPS
(in percent of students)

	Fourth Quarter	Seventh Quarter	Tenth Quarter
Fall 1981 Entrants			
ISP Formal (n=36)	69.4%	44.4%	30.6%
ISP Informal (n=24)	83.3	58.3	33.3
ISP Declined (n=57)	75.4	49.1	33.3
Fall 1982 Entrants			
ISP Formal (n=20)	55.0	30.0	NA
ISP Informal (n=24)	70.8	50.0	NA
ISP Declined (n=94)	71.3	56.4	NA
ISP Excluded (n=45)	84.4	68.9	NA

NA=not available

Retention figures for Fall 1982 entrants suggest that there are two tiers within the EOP special action population. All ISP students--formal, informal and declined--are, by definition, the most high risk of this population. They come in with statistically lower admit GPAs and, at least among winter and spring participants, experience more academic difficulty. Excluded students experience little difficulty in their course work and remain at the University in numbers equal to their regularly admitted cohorts.

One of the primary reasons ISP participants leave the University is difficulty with their course work. Close to 80% of the formal and informal students who left after their first, second or third year did so with a current or cumulative GPA of less than 2.0. Whatever impact ISP has on academic performance seems insufficient to reverse the trend of attrition in academic difficulty among EOP special action entrants, as recommended by the UC Davis Retention Task Force.

Detailed profiles of ISP students who left the University after their first year are presented in Appendix D. Tables D-1 through D-4 indicate that it is very difficult to distinguish between ISP students who succeed at the University and those who do not based on entering academic characteristics. Many of the eventual dropouts were summer STEP attendees who were not invited to participate in ISP during fall quarter. These students were apparently not seen at the time as high enough risks to merit an ISP intervention.

However, first quarter academic performance data indicate which students are the most likely to drop out after fall quarter. For both years and levels of participation, dropouts earned lower GPAs during their first quarter. ISP intervention after fall quarter, for two to five hours per week, was not an adequate intervention for these students.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The Individualized Study Program consists of a tracking and academic advising system (the Early Warning System), a reduced study load option and basic skills workshops. The Early Warning System is the largest component in terms of students receiving services; EWS contacted from 70 to 100 special action EOP students after each fall and winter quarter in the first two years of operation. A separate evaluation of this system suggests that the EWS is an important intermediate step toward improving the retention rates of special action EOP students. Students counseled through this system are likely to follow the academic advice they receive and to earn successful grades in targeted course work. Interviewed students have fourth quarter retention rates 15 to 20% higher than students who were not interviewed.

This evaluation seeks evidence of identifiable effects from the reduced study load and basic skills workshop components of ISP. The number of students who chose these options varied from quarter to quarter; from 13 to 31 students participated formally or informally in any given quarter during the two years under study. Students who choose to participate in these two components of ISP come into the program in two ways: 1) fall participants are selected from summer STEP students who, in the view of LSC staff, could benefit from a quarter of basic skills development or 2) students granted a waiver from summer STEP. Winter and spring quarter participants, selected through the Early Warning System, are interviewed by LSC staff and during these interviews are strongly encouraged to participate in the program. All winter and spring quarter participants experienced some academic difficulty in the previous quarter; thus, given that academic performance in college is the strongest predictor of further academic performance, these students represent an extremely high risk group.

Students invited to participate in ISP fall quarter, but who chose not to do so, and students who received a letter after fall or winter quarter inviting them into ISP, but who either were not encouraged to participate in the program during their EWS interviews or were not interviewed, make up the ISP comparison groups. These students have average SAT scores from 70 to 120 points higher than ISP workshop participants. Although they have similar entering GPAs, they may well be better prepared for college level work than program participants. However, like program participants, most students in the comparison groups were in academic difficulty after either fall or winter quarter; given their academic performance, they are also at high risk and thus represent the closest comparable group.

Most students in all ISP groups--formal, informal and declined--participated in the Early Warning System. These students were heavily counseled in course load and course selection, received tutoring and, where necessary, received referrals to appropriate support services. In addition to EWS services, formal participants attended basic skills workshops and reduced their study loads; informal participants attended the same workshops but did not reduce their study loads.

ISP formal participants fulfilled their contracts and earned approximately the same GPAs as informal participants and students who did not receive intensive counselor assistance. This absence of significant differences in GPAs resulting from choice of the reduced study load option was demonstrated in the interim evaluation of this program. Tracking students through their second year did not reveal any long term effects of the reduced study load option. However, formal participants entered the University with considerably lower SAT scores and, for the most part, reduced their course loads only one unit. These factors may constitute one explanation for not seeing any differences in overall academic performance resulting from use of this option. Fourth quarter retention rates for formal participants were 6 to 15% lower than those of informal participants and students in the comparison groups. Although formal participants did not take 12 units for one quarter, they completed about the same number of minimum progress units as other students. At the end of both three and six quarters there were no statistical differences in minimum progress units earned based on program status.

There do not appear to be any group differences in overall academic performance resulting from workshop participation. Formal and informal program participants earn about the same GPAs as students who do not participate in the workshops. However, tracking workshop participants' progress in specific target courses taken during or immediately after workshop participation does suggest a positive effect from this assistance. In particular, students who attended verbal workshops earned satisfactory grades in both remedial and nonremedial English courses. This finding is striking in view of the academic underpreparation indicated by their very low SAT scores. Students who attended math workshops experienced more limited success in mathematics courses, suggesting that two hours per week of basic skills work may not be sufficient for students with weak backgrounds in this area.

Most students entered ISP in winter and spring quarters after having earned at least one unsatisfactory grade. Overall, students spent two to five hours per week in basic skills workshops and, as intended, spent only one quarter in the program. The data in this report suggest that intensive remedial assistance taken during the first quarter may benefit some students. Fall 1981 formal participants outperformed their comparison group and consistently maintained passing GPAs. Fall 1982 formal and informal participants did as well or better than their comparison group, even though they entered the University with significantly lower SAT scores. On the other hand, students who received similar assistance, but later in the year after experiencing considerable academic difficulty, did not benefit as much. In general, although these students reduced the number of units of unsatisfactory grades earned during a quarter, they did not improve sufficiently to get out of academic difficulty. ISP intensive counselor assistance for two to five hours per week was not an adequate intervention strategy for these students. As the profiles and academic performance data in Appendix D indicate, most students who eventually left the University in academic difficulty were unable to succeed in their course work overall, even while receiving intensive counselor assistance. These data give credence to the recommendation presented in the interim evaluation report that the target population for the ISP intervention, particularly during winter and spring quarters, be reassessed.

The results of this evaluation of the reduced study load option and workshop participation suggest the following recommendations:

1. As a group, formal participants appear neither to have been significantly helped nor harmed by their selection of the reduced study load option. They do not outperform informal participants or nonparticipants nor do they fall behind these students in minimum progress units. Their fourth quarter retention rates are slightly lower than those of the other two groups, although their SAT scores suggest that they may be the most underprepared for University study. Because ISP includes only a small number of students and because there was no abuse of the reduced study load option, use of this option should continue on a limited case-by-case basis at the discretion of the Program Director.

2. Intensive remedial assistance should continue to be offered to special action EOP students during their first quarter at UC Davis. Two hours per week attendance at verbal workshops for a single quarter appears to be a sufficient intervention for most students needing help in this area. Students needing assistance in developing basic skills in mathematics may require more intensive intervention, possibly for more than a single quarter.

3. Students with GPAs below 2.0 or with several units of unsuccessful grades at the end of their first quarter appear likely to continue in academic difficulty and drop out of the University. ISP assistance as implemented during the two years under study has not reversed this trend. ISP does not appear to be an adequate intervention for these students. Consequently, consideration should be given to finding an adequate intervention for these students and to limiting the current program during winter and spring quarters.

PROGRAM RESPONSE TO EVALUATION FINDINGS

April 18, 1985

TO: Celeste Hunziker

FR: Virginia Martucci

RE: EVALUATION OF THE INDIVIDUALIZED STUDY PROGRAM
REDUCED STUDY LOAD OPTION AND BASIC SKILLS WORKSHOPS

Thank you for inviting my and my staff's comments on the referenced report.

Overall, we feel the report is thorough and fair; however, we do have the following concerns, given that many readers will be unfamiliar with ISP and the students it serves:

1) Page 4, paragraph 4, describes ISP declined students as having been "invited to participate in ISP" and page 15, paragraph 2, as having "declined . . . services." While 60% of these students were interviewed as part of the Early Warning System (EWS), they were not encouraged to participate in ISP. As the Executive Summary of the EWS Report notes, "All students for whom the Individualized Study Program was recommended during the interview participated in ISP workshops and development activities." Thus, ISP "declined" is an inaccurate and misleading descriptor for this comparison group.

2) Pages 5 and 6 note the heavy contamination of the ISP "declined" comparison groups due to their having participated in the EWS, a critical program feature. We believe this fact should also have been emphasized in the Summary and Conclusions section as some readers may peruse only that portion of the report.

3) The discussion of program results on page 19 (21) and in recommendation 1 seems to assume that ISP formal participants should have done better than informal participants and ISP "declined" students in order for the program to have demonstrated a positive impact on student performance/retention. We question this assumption. Although formal participants entered clearly less well prepared than the other groups and took fewer than 12 units during at least one quarter, they nonetheless completed approximately the same number of minimum progress units, earned approximately the same GPAs, and remained at the University in about the same numbers. One could argue that in the absence of any intervention, they would most likely have performed considerably less well than the other groups. Thus, the sheer fact that they kept up is suggestive of program success.

4) Because the comparison groups used are so heavily contaminated, we believe a better way of determining program impact would be to measure ISP participants' retention rates against those of comparable EOP special action students admitted prior to Fall 1981. Such students strike us as the only possible non-contaminated comparison group and, given that ISP was launched to enhance the retention rate of high risk STEP students, the most logical one.

5) We recognize that a qualitative evaluation of ISP, perhaps using case histories, is probably not feasible. Yet, a purely statistical approach seems distinctly inappropriate. By its very nature, ISP attempts to deal with each student as an individual. Often, the reasons for a student's success or failure are indeed complex. As responses to the 1982 ISP Telephone Survey indicated, ISP students' frustrations are many, their lack of self-confidence sometimes acute, and their need for support, both academic and non-academic, apparent. Similar factors had also been noted in the report of the UC Davis Task Force on Retention and Transfer; thus, ISP was conceived as a multi-faceted program involving not only academic skill building, but personal counseling, financial assistance, academic advising, timely intervention, and so on. A case history or other qualitative approach could not only illuminate these non-quantifiable program dimensions, it could also provide information useful both to program planning and to acquainting the campus community with the complex reality responsible for the retention rate of special action students. And, in our experience, inadequate academic preparation is only a small part of that reality.

In any case, despite our concerns, we believe that your report will lead to program improvements. Specifically, we intend to target future Summer STEP students with characteristics similar to those of the ISP groups studied. We can then ensure that these students receive especially careful counseling and advising, particular consideration for Fall ISP, and, if appropriate, pre-arranged tutoring for fall quarter. In addition, we will reconsider our approach to winter and spring participants. Perhaps we've been too cautious in encouraging students to reduce their unit loads; perhaps more directive advice is needed in relation to choice of major; perhaps more information should be provided on programs available at other institutions and on the transfer process. We'll give these and other possibilities more thought.

Again, we appreciate the opportunity to comment, the considerable time and energy you devoted to the report, and the impetus it has given us to take a fresh look at various program elements.

VFM:ajs

INDIVIDUALIZED STUDY PROGRAM: DESCRIPTION OF OFFERINGS

A. General Offerings

1. Study Skills Techniques
   Counselor: Maria Mitchum
   Time Commitment: 1 individual hour per week.
   Description: On an individual basis, students will learn to apply effective study techniques: time management, note-taking (lecture and text), listening, exam-taking (essay and objective), and memory strategies.

2. Transitional Counseling
   Counselors: Gary Perkins and Naomi Sakai
   Time Commitment: 1 hour per week
   Description: Individuals or groups will address issues related to orientation and transition to campus life. Possible topics include academic goal setting; effective use of student services; assertive communication with faculty and staff; developing a supportive network, and addressing personal issues that may interfere with studies.

B. Special Topics Offerings

1. Mathematics Review
   Counselor: Ward Stewart
   Time Commitment: Variable
   Description: Under supervision, students will work individually in the Center's Learning Laboratory to learn or review mathematics concepts pre-requisite to the courses they either are enrolled in or intend to enroll in. For example, Math B students will have the opportunity to review decimals, percentages, proportions, and geometry; Math D students will have the opportunity to review functions and basic algebra, as well as gain additional practice in problem-solving for advanced algebra; opportunities to review trigonometry and gain additional practice in solving statistics problems will also be available. Students will take periodic examinations to ensure that they have mastered material and will meet weekly with LSC's Math Coordinator to review their progress.

2. Pre-Chemistry Workshop
   Counselor: Jim Hollister
   Time Commitment: 2 hours per week
   Description: Students who intend to enroll in Chemistry 1A during their first year will attend a weekly group lecture/discussion of basic principles of chemistry. They will spend an additional hour of supervised problem-solving each week. A final examination will be given to determine the student's readiness for Chemistry 1A. Individual conferences will also be arranged as necessary.

3. Language Series
Counselors: Joan Rothstein, Barbara Gunn, Maria Mitchum, Palma Lower, and Sally Alexander
Time Commitment: Variable
Description: Students will participate in one or more of the following:

Writing Skills: Students will participate in supervised, structured writing practice and revision sessions, as well as receive comments on their performance and meet individually with a writing specialist each week (a total of 4 hours) to review essay structure and organization, paragraph development, and grammar.

Reading Strategies: Both on an individual basis and in groups, students will learn strategies necessary to reading college textbooks effectively. Pre-reading techniques, comprehension skills, and ways to improve retention will be stressed. In addition, students will learn how to identify elements of course organization in order to increase study-reading effectiveness. Vocabulary improvement and rate-building exercises will be assigned as necessary.

English Skills: Students whose native language is not English and students who need basic language skills will do intensive work on grammar, vocabulary, and fundamental writing skills. Stress will be on improving command of the verb system of English and the vocabulary and sentence structures used in university-level work. Exercises and instruction will focus on materials from current classes and learning lab reference texts.

INDIVIDUALIZED STUDY PROGRAM CONTRACT

The Individualized Study Program offers Special Action students an opportunity to take fewer than 12 units in a given quarter, while retaining the level of financial aid for which they have qualified. This opportunity is provided with the following stipulation: THE STUDENT MUST AGREE TO SPEND 9 HOURS (IF THE STUDENT IS TAKING 9 COURSE UNITS) OR 12 HOURS (IF THE STUDENT IS TAKING 8 COURSE UNITS) PER WEEK PURSUING AN INDIVIDUALIZED COURSE OF STUDY AND COUNSELING AT THE LEARNING SKILLS CENTER. MOREOVER, THE STUDENT IS REQUIRED TO FULLY PARTICIPATE IN HIS/HER PROGRAM EACH WEEK. FULL PARTICIPATION IS DEFINED AS AT LEAST 90% ATTENDANCE AT ALL ACTIVITIES AND CLEAR EVIDENCE OF EFFORT. FAILURE TO PARTICIPATE FULLY WILL RESULT IN THE STUDENT'S BEING DROPPED FROM THE PROGRAM. BECAUSE STUDENTS WHO ARE DROPPED FROM THE PROGRAM WILL NOT MEET THE MINIMUM PROGRESS REQUIREMENTS OF THEIR COLLEGE, THEY WILL ENDANGER THEIR ACADEMIC STANDING AT THE UNIVERSITY.

I agree to fully participate (at least 90% attendance and clear evidence of effort) in the Individualized Study Program outlined below during _____ Quarter 198 .

A. General Offerings

1. Study Skills Techniques--1 hour per week, plus an additional hour during weeks 2, 4, and 9

2. Group Orientation Sessions--1-1/2 hours per week, plus individual follow-up as needed

B. Special Topics Offerings

1.

2.

3.

TOTAL WEEKLY COMMITMENT -- HOURS

I understand that failure to follow-through on my agreement will result in my being dropped from the program and not meeting the minimum progress requirements of my college.

STUDENT SIGNATURE: _____

DATE: _____

EOP COUNSELOR SIGNATURE: _____

LSC COUNSELOR SIGNATURE: _____

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX C

TABLE C-1
INDIVIDUALIZED STUDY PROGRAM
WEEKLY PROGRAM HOURS BY WORKSHOP

	Fall 1981 Entrants		Fall 1982 Entrants	
	ISP Formal (n=36)	ISP Informal (n=24)	ISP Formal (n=20)	ISP Informal (n=24)
Verbal Workshops				
Percent of Students[1]	86.1%	75.0%	60.0%	83.3%
Avg. Hours per Week per Student	2.94	2.50	2.62	1.91
Math Workshops				
Percent of Students	72.2%	41.7%	55.0%	20.8%
Avg. Hours per Week per Student	2.70	1.91	2.32	1.80
Science Workshops				
Percent of Students	11.1%	12.5%	5.0%	0.0%
Avg. Hours per Week per Student	2.75	1.67	2.50	0.0%
General Offerings[2]				
Percent of Students	41.7%	0.0%	70.0%	25.0%
Avg. Hours per Week per Student	1.40	0.0%	1.11	1.00
Average Weekly Program Hours per Student	5.37	2.62	3.75	2.11

[1]Students may take more than one type of workshop.
[2]Includes study skills workshops and group orientation sessions.

APPENDIX D

PROFILES OF ISP STUDENTS WHO DID NOT RETURN FOR A SECOND YEAR

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE D-1
PROFILE OF ISP FORMAL STUDENTS WHO DID NOT RETURN FOR A SECOND YEAR
Fall 1981 Entrants

Admit GPA	SAT M	SAT V	Major	FALL QUARTER STEP/ISP Activity	Curr GPA	Wkld Attm	Wkld Unsuc[1]	WINTER QUARTER EWS Activity	Curr GPA	Wkld Attm	Wkld Unsuc	SPRING QUARTER EWS Activity	Curr GPA	Wkld Attm	Wkld Unsuc	CUMULATIVE[2] GPA	CUMULATIVE[2] Wkld Units
Student 1				STEP A													
2.38			BioSci	ISP Formal	NA	09	03	Not Called	0.00	15	06	Contacted/ ISP Formal	0.00	06	06	0.00	20
Student 2*				STEP A													
2.67			Undecl	ISP Formal	NA	09	00	Not Called	--	--	--	Could Not Reach	--	--	--	NA	09
Student 3*				STEP B													
2.50			Psych	ISP Formal	NA	11	06	Not Called	--	--	--	Not Called	--	--	--	NA	05
Student 4				STEP B													
2.60			Undecl	ISP Formal	1.65	08	04	Not Called	2.00	10	04	Not Called	--	--	--	1.84	18
Student 5				STEP A													
1.22			Undecl	ISP Formal	3.03	11	00	Not Called	2.30	07	03	Not Called	--	--	--	2.70	15
Student 6				STEP A				Contacted/				Could Not					
2.50	380	370	BioSci	Not Invited	1.00	16	12	ISP Formal	1.00	10	07	Reach	--	--	--	1.00	18
Student 7				STEP A				Contacted/				Could Not					
3.07	480	360	PolSci	Not Invited	2.00	11	07	ISP Formal	0.50	09	06	Reach	1.45	12	08	1.36	20
Student 8			Mass	STEP B				Contacted/									
3.53	420	340	Comm	Not Invited	1.56	14	06	ISP Formal	1.96	10	00	Not Called	--	--	--	1.73	23
Student 9				STEP B				Contacted/									
3.77			AnSci	Not Invited	2.70	13	07	ISP Formal	2.37	08	00	Not Called	1.70	12	00	2.17	26
Student 10				STEP A				Contacted/				Contacted/					
2.64	350	390	AnSci	Not Invited	1.00	12	08	Declined ISP	0.00	12	06	ISP Formal	1.00	04	04	0.54	15
Student 11				STEP B								Contacted/					
3.08			Undecl	Not Invited	2.00	04	00	Not Called	0.00	08	04	ISP Formal	--	--	--	1.00	08

	Stayed (n=25)	Left (n=11)
Admit GPA	2.63	2.72
SAT M/SAT V	383/313	407/365
Mean 1st Qtr GPA	2.12	1.86
% with 1st Qtr GPA ≥ 2.0	75%	50%

*Did not complete ISP contract.
Dash indicates no units attempted, or student withdrew from the University.
NA indicates no units attempted for a grade.
Blank indicates data not available.

[1]Received NP or U grades, or grades below C-. Does not include incompletes.
[2]As of the last completed quarter.

TABLE D-2
PROFILE OF ISP INFORMAL STUDENTS WHO DID NOT RETURN FOR A SECOND YEAR
Fall 1981 Entrants

Admit GPA	SAT M	SAT V	Major	FALL QUARTER STEP/ISP Activity	Curr GPA	Wkld Attm	Wkld Unsuc[1]	WINTER QUARTER EWS Activity	Curr GPA	Wkld Attm	Wkld Unsuc	SPRING QUARTER EWS Activity	Curr GPA	Wkld Attm	Wkld Unsuc	CUMULATIVE[2] GPA	CUMULATIVE[2] Wkld Units
Student 1				STEP B				Contacted/									
2.92	390	270	BioChem	Declined	0.31	12	12	ISP Informal	0.73	12	07	Not Called	1.42	08	04	0.79	16
Student 2				STEP A				Contacted/				Contacted/					
2.81	300	290	BioSci	Not Invited	2.00	14	03	ISP Informal	3.30	15	00	ISP Informal	3.00	11	07	2.71	30
Student 3				STEP A				Contacted/				Could Not Be					
2.44	400	440	Engr	Not Invited	1.52	14	03	ISP Informal	0.00	12	12	Reached	2.67	11	00	1.66	27
Student 4				STEP A				Contacted/				Contacted/					
3.08	530	330	Engr	Not Invited	2.30	12	04	Declined ISP	0.84	12	09	ISP Informal	2.63	08	05	1.48	24

	Stayed (n=20)	Left (n=4)
Admit GPA	2.82	2.81
SAT M/SAT V	399/361	405/282
Mean 1st Qtr GPA	2.34	1.53
% with 1st Qtr GPA $\geq$ 2.0	78.9%	50.0%

Dash indicates no units attempted, or student withdrew from the University.
NA indicates no units attempted for a grade.
Blank indicates data not available.

[1]Received NP or U grades, or grades below C-. Does not include incompletes.
[2]As of the last completed quarter.

TABLE D-3
PROFILE OF ISP FORMAL STUDENTS WHO DID NOT RETURN FOR A SECOND YEAR
Fall 1982 Entrants

Admit GPA	SAT M	SAT V	Major	FALL QUARTER STEP/ISP Activity	Curr GPA	Wkld Attm	Wkld Unsuc[1]	WINTER QUARTER EWS Activity	Curr GPA	Wkld Attm	Wkld Unsuc	SPRING QUARTER EWS Activity	Curr GPA	Wkld Attm	Wkld Unsuc	CUMULATIVE[2] GPA	CUMULATIVE[2] Wkld Units
Student 1				STEP B				Could Not				Could Not					
2.56	370	210	Econ	ISP Formal	0.65	11	08	Reach	--	--	--	Reach	--	--	--	0.65	07
Student 2				STEP A				Contacted/				Could Not					
3.00	330	410	BioSci	Not Invited	0.00	15	15	ISP Formal	--	--	--	Reach	--	--	--	0.00	00
Student 3				STEP A				Contacted/				Contacted/					
2.43			English	Not Invited	0.00	08	02	ISP Formal	0.00	11	11	ISP Informal	1.00	15	11	0.62	12
Student 4				STEP A				Contacted/				Could Not					
2.26	400	300	BioSci	Not Invited	1.70	17	07	ISP Formal	0.56	11	07	Reach	--	--	--	1.02	14
Student 5				STEP A				Contacted/				Contacted/					
2.20			BioSci	Not Invited	NA	12	07	ISP Formal	1.38	11	04	Interviewed	0.85	12	08	1.13	27
Student 6*				STEP A				Contacted/				Could Not					
2.75	310	260	Engr	Not Invited	1.85	13	10	ISP Formal	1.80	11	03	Reach	0.00	13	13	1.36	18
Student 7				STEP B				Contacted/				Contacted/					
2.89			PolSci	Not Invited	2.35	14	04	ISP Formal	4.00	11	04	Interviewed	1.70	18	10	2.33	30
Student 8				STEP A				Contacted/				Not					
2.76	380	460	Undecl	Not Invited	1.57	13	04	ISP Formal	2.73	11	00	Contacted	2.97	14	00	2.48	39
Student 9				STEP B				Contacted/				Contacted/					
2.31			BioSci	Not Invited	1.80	13	03	Interviewed	2.36	14	09	ISP Formal	1.45	11	03	1.82	26

	Stayed (n=11)	Left (n=9)
Admit GPA	2.87	2.57
SAT M/SAT V	408/295	328/358
Mean 1st Qtr GPA	2.34	1.24
% with 1st Qtr GPA $\geq$ 2.0	77.8%	12.5%

*Did not complete ISP contract.
Dash indicates no units attempted, or student withdrew from the University.
NA indicates no units attempted for a grade.
Blank indicates data not available.

[1]Received NP or U grades, or grades below C-. Does not include incompletes.
[2]As of the last completed quarter.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE D-4
PROFILE OF ISP INFORMAL STUDENTS WHO DID NOT RETURN FOR A SECOND YEAR
Fall 1982 Entrants

Admit GPA	SAT M	SAT V	Major	FALL QUARTER STEP/ISP Activity	Curr GPA	Wkld Attm	Wkld Unsuc[1]	WINTER QUARTER EMS Activity	Curr GPA	Wkld Attm	Wkld Unsuc	SPRING QUARTER EMS Activity	Curr GPA	Wkld Attm	Wkld Unsuc	CUMULATIVE[2] GPA	CUMULATIVE[2] Wkld Units
Student 1																	
2.76	310	230	Pre-Math	STEP A Informal	2.23	14	03	Not Contacted	1.85	11	04	Could Not Reach	1.34	15	09	1.72	36
Student 2																	
2.60			Psych	STEP B Informal	1.80	12	03	Contacted/ Refused Interview	--	--	--	Could Not Reach	--	--	--	1.80	12
Student 3																	
2.38			Undecl	STEP B Informal	2.36	13	06	Could Not Reach	2.30	12	08	Could Not Reach	--	--	--	2.34	15
Student 4																	
2.64	350	230	PolSci	STEP A Not Invited	NA	13	10	Contacted/ ISP Informal	0.00	07	07	Contacted/ ISP Informal	2.42	11	02	1.34	16
Student 5																	
3.06			Pre-Math	STEP B Not Invited	1.98	13	03	Contacted/ ISP Informal	1.76	09	03	Contacted/ Refused Interview	2.50	06	00	2.02	29
Student 6																	
3.49			BioSci	STEP B Not Invited	--	--	--	Contacted/ ISP Informal	1.90	08	04	Could Not Reach	3.00	08	00	2.48	16
Student 7																	
2.50	380	400	Mex-Am Studies	STEP A Declined	1.90	20	07	Contacted/ Interviewed	1.70	13	03	Contacted/ ISP Informal	2.10	12	00	1.90	30

	Stayed (n=17)	Left (n=7)
Admit GPA	2.87	2.77
SAT M/SAT V	433/362	346/286
Mean 1st Qtr GPA	2.52	2.05
% with 1st Qtr GPA ≥ 2.0	86.7%	40.0%

Dash indicates no units attempted, or student withdrew from the University.
NA indicates no units attempted for a grade.
Blank indicates data not available.

[1]Received NP or U grades, or grades below C-. Does not include incompletes.
[2]As of the last completed quarter.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE